1				
	Case 1:21-cv-01638-DAD-SAB Do	ocument 8	Filed 01/19/22	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES	S DISTRI	ICT COURT	1
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10	Ensited of oren order			
11	RYAN RANELLS,	Case N	o. 1:21-cv-01638	-DAD-SAB
12	Plaintiff,		R REQUIRING P POSITION OR S	LAINTIFF TO FILE
13	v.	NON-C	OPPOSITION TO	DEFENDANTS'
14	UR M. JADDOU, et al.,		MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME (ECF No. 6)	
15	Defendants.	,	FOURTEEN-DAY DEADLINE	
16		FOUR	IEEN-DAI DEA	DLINE
17				
18	Plaintiff Ryan Ranells, proceeding pro se, initiated this matter on November 10, 2021			
19	against Defendants UR M. Jaddou, the Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services			
20	(USCIS), Alejandro Mayorkas, Secretary of U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and Kathy			
21	A. Baran, Acting Director of USCIS California Service Center. (ECF No. 1.) The complaint			
22	alleges violations of the Administrative Procedure Act arising from the denial of Plaintiff's			
23	application to expedite processing of his K-1 fiancée visa petition and seeks expedited adjudication			
24	of the application. (Id.) On December 16, 2021, executed summonses were filed; the deadline for			
25	Defendants to file a response to the complaint is January 21, 2022. (See ECF No. 5.)			
26	On January 18, 2022, Defendants filed the instant motion for a five-month extension of			
27	time to file an answer to the complaint. (EC	CF No. 6.) D	Defendants proffer	that Plaintiff filed the

28 fiancée visa petition at issue in this case approximately four months ago; that the average

processing time for a fiancée visa petition is seven to nine and a half months; and that it is therefore likely USCIS will complete adjudication of Plaintiff's petition within the remaining five months of the typical adjudications period, thus rendering the complaint moot. (ECF No. 6 at 1–2; Decl. Sec. Chief of Cal. Service Cntr. of USCIS, ECF No. 6-1.) The motion does not set a hearing date, nor do Defendants indicate whether they attempted to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding the requested extension.

The Local Rules of the Eastern District of California provide that a party having no opposition to the granting of a motion shall file a statement of non-opposition. E.D. Cal. L.R. 230(c). The Court shall require Plaintiff to either file an opposition to the motion for an extension of time or file a statement of non-opposition. If there is no opposition, the parties may stipulate to the requested extension of time.

Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff shall file an opposition or a statement of non-opposition to Defendants' motion for a five-month extension of time within **fourteen (14) days** of the date of entry of this order. If Plaintiff opposes the motion, Defendants shall file a reply within seven (7) days of the opposition.

T IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **January 19, 2022**

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Luy S. / De